

Remarks

Claims 1-6 and 10-12 are pending in the application, of which the Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 and 10-12. By this paper, Applicant amends claims 1 and 6 and adds new claims 13-15.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Rejection of Claims 1-2 and 5-6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Fraser In View of Sukeda et al.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2 and 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraser (USPA 2004/0172236) in view of Sukeda et al. (USPN 5,854,997).

Amended claim 1 now requires "a two-sided visual display facility having a first side and a second side parallel to the first side, which when in use, face opposing directions". Fraser does not teach, suggest, or provide any reason to include a two-sided visual display facility as required in claim 1. Sukeda et al. teaches a display device having "displays 102, 103. . . inverted relative to the other display" and "the two opposing displays arranged side by side for the sake of convenience". (See column 4, lines 1-3 and column 4, lines 60-62, see also Figure 1.)

Sukeda envisages that the screens, when in operation, lie adjacent one another facing the same direction. This is evidenced from the arrangement shown in Figure 1, and taken further in Figure 10 of Sukeda in which a single screen is divided into two areas. Further support is provided in the description which stating the displays are arranged side by side for convenience (col. 6 lines 53 – 62). The device of figure 1 is arranged such that when the screens are folded open, as illustrated in figure 1, the edges of the screen housings abut one another about the hinged edge. Because, inevitably, the housings have a finite depth, the abutment prevents the screens from being further opened towards an orientation in which the screens would be back-to-back. Therefore, Sukeda et al. teaches two display areas arranged side by side and not "a two-sided visual display facility having a first side and a second side, which when in use, face opposing directions" as required by claim 1. Therefore, Sukeda et al. does not teach, suggest, or provide

all of the limitations of claim 1, and additionally teaches away from the limitations of claim 1. Therefore since the combination of Fraser and Sukeda et al. does not teach, suggest, or provide all of the limitations of claim 1, claim 1 is nonobvious.

Claims 2 and 5 depend from claim 1 and are therefore nonobvious over the combination of Fraser and Sukeda et al. for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Amended claim 6 requires "a display device for displaying information to two people on different sides of the display device, the sides opposing one another and facing opposite directions". Fraser does not teach, suggest, or provide any reason to include a two-sided visual display facility as required in claim 6. Sukeda et al. teaches a display device having "displays 102, 103. . . inverted relative to the other display" and "the two opposing displays arranged side by side for the sake of convenience". (See column 4, lines 1-3 and column 4, lines 60-62, see also Figure 1.) Sukeda envisages that the screens, when in operation, lie adjacent one another facing the same direction. This is evidenced from the arrangement shown in Figure 1, and taken further in Figure 10 of Sukeda in which a single screen is divided into two areas. Further support is provided in the description which stating the displays are arranged side by side for convenience (col. 6 lines 53 – 62). The device of figure 1 is arranged such that when the screens are folded open, as illustrated in figure 1, the edges of the screen housings abut one another about the hinged edge. Because, inevitably, the housings have a finite depth, the abutment prevents the screens from being further opened towards an orientation in which the screens would be back-to-back. Therefore, Sukeda et al. teaches two display areas arranged side by side and not "a display device for displaying information to two people on different sides of the display device, the sides opposing one another and facing opposite directions" as required by claim 6. Therefore, Sukeda et al. does not teach, suggest, or provide all of the limitations of claim 6, and additionally teaches away from the limitations of claim 6. Therefore since the combination of Fraser and Sukeda et al. does not teach, suggest, or provide all of the limitations of claim 6, claim 6 is nonobvious.

**Rejection of Claims 3 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Over Fraser In View of Sukeda et al. and Further In View of Jacobs**

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraser in view of Sukeda et al. and further in view of Jacobs (USPN 4,311,465).

Claim 3 requires "wherein the database further comprises a pack of cards; and wherein the two-sided display facility further comprises each card in the pack of cards carrying a respective message. . . in language L1. . . on a first side of a card, and in language L2 on a second side of the card." Additionally, claim 3 depends from claim 1 which requires "a two-sided visual display facility having a first side and a second side parallel to the first side, which when in use, face opposing directions". As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the combination of Fraser and Sukeda et al. does not teach, suggest, or provide all of the limitations of claim 1. Jacobs teaches the use of two cards to display translation information, not a dual sided card. In fact the use of two cards is necessary as one card acts as an indicator to depict the word chosen on the other card (col 2 lines 4- 28 & column 3 line 22-25). Therefore, Jacobs does not teach, suggest, or provide any reason to include all of the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 and dependant claim 3 are nonobvious over the combination of Fraser in view of Sukeda et al. and further in view of Jacobs.

Claim 11 depends from claim 3 and is therefore nonobvious over the combination of Fraser, Sukeda et al. and Jacobs for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 3.

**Rejections of Claims 4, 10 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
As Being Unpatentable Over Fraser In View of
Sukeda et al. In View of Jacobs and Further In View of Mestre**

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraser in view of Sukeda et al. in view of Jacobs and further in view of Mestre (USPN 6,999,915).

Claims 4, 10 and 12 all depend from parent claim 1. Amended claim 1 requires "a two-sided visual display facility having a first side and a second side parallel to the first side, which when in use, face opposing directions, the first side for displaying a message. . . in the first language L1. . . and the second side for displaying a selected message in the second language L2". Fraser and Sukeda et al. do not teach, suggest, or provide any reason to include all of the limitations of claim 1 as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Jacobs teaches the use of two cards to display translation information, not a dual sided card. In fact the use of two cards is necessary as one card acts as an indicator to depict the word chosen on the other card (col 2 lines 4- 28 & column 3 line 22-25). Therefore, Jacobs does not teach, suggest, or provide any reason to include all of the limitations of claim 1. Mestre teaches a process and a page 100 shown in Figure 1, and does not teach a first side and a second side opposed from the first side as required by claim 1. Therefore, the combination of Fraser, Sukeda, Jacobs and Mestre do not teach, suggest, or provide any reason to include all of the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 and dependent claims 4, 10 and 12 are nonobvious over the combination of references.

New Claims

By this paper, Applicant adds new claims 13-15 which are believed to be novel and nonobvious over Fraser, Sukeda et al., Jacobs, and Mestre. Support for new claims 13-15 is found in the as-filed specification.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ROGER PAYN

By /Tiffany A. Fidler/
Tiffany A. Fidler
Reg. No. 65,366
Agent for Applicant

Date: 09/07/2010

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351